

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

ASAD GILANI,

Plaintiff,

-v-

DELOITTE LLP et al.,

Defendants.

23-CV-4755 (JMF)

ORDER


JESSE M. FURMAN, United States District Judge:

On September 4, 2024, the Court issued an Opinion and Order granting in part and denying in part Defendants’ motion to dismiss the operative Third Amended Complaint. ECF No. 130. On September 26, 2024, Plaintiff submitted a motion for reconsideration of that Order. ECF No. 142. As Plaintiff presents no valid grounds for reconsideration, the motion is DENIED. *See, e.g., Analytical Survs., Inc. v. Tonga Partners, L.P.*, 684 F.3d 36, 52 (2d Cir. 2012) (“It is well-settled that [a motion for reconsideration] is not a vehicle for relitigating old issues, presenting the case under new theories, securing a rehearing on the merits, or otherwise taking a second bite at the apple. Rather, the standard for granting a . . . motion for reconsideration is strict, and reconsideration will generally be denied unless the moving party can point to controlling decisions or data that the court overlooked.” (cleaned up)). The purported pieces of “new evidence” offered in support of Plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration do nothing to alter the Court’s conclusion that Plaintiff failed to state a claim for discrimination or retaliation on the basis of age. *See* ECF No. 130, at 7-9. At best, they pertain to his claims for disability discrimination and retaliation, which were *not* dismissed. *See id.* at 10-14.

The Clerk of Court is directed to terminate ECF No. 142.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 26, 2024  
New York, New York

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JESSE M. FURMAN  
United States District Judge